

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

San Francisco Division

TIMOTHY V. LONG and TRAJHAN A.
LONG,

Case No. 18-cv-03694-LB

Plaintiffs,

V.

CITY OF PITTSBURG, MICHAEL
CRAIGTON, and JONATHAN ELMORE,

REFERRAL TO DETERMINE WHETHER CASES ARE RELATED

Defendants.

On June 20, 2018, plaintiff Timothy V. Long filed a complaint, an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), and, simultaneously, a motion to reopen under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 in a case titled *Bengard v. City of Pittsburgh*, No. 4:17-cv-02730-KAW.¹ (Mr. Long captioned the motion with the case number from the *Bengard* case but crossed it out and initialed it; the clerk’s office thus filed the motion in this action.) In the motion, which Mr. Long purports to bring on his son Trajhan’s behalf, Mr. Long challenges the settlement (and minor’s compromise) in the *Bengard* case on the ground that he — and not the guardian ad litem there

¹ Compl. – ECF No. 1 at 1; Application – ECF No. 2; Motion – ECF No. 4. Citations refer to material in the Electronic Case File (“ECF”); pinpoint citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of documents.

1 (Latricia Bengard) — is Trahan’s legal guardian.² In his complaint in this case, Mr. Long does not
2 specify facts but liberally construed, he asks for “fair compensation” for the events at issue in the
3 *Bengard* case.³

4 The court previously ordered Mr. Long to file an amended IFP application or pay the \$400
5 filing fee because — although he said he was unemployed — he listed monthly gross income of
6 \$8,000 from food stamps and welfare.⁴ Mr. Long did not respond to the court’s orders.⁵

7 The court has now read Mr. Long’s filings closely and refers the case to United States
8 Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore to consider whether the case is related to case number No.
9 4:17-cv-02730-KAW.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: September 24, 2018



12
13 LAUREL BEELER
14 United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

² Motion – ECF No. 4 at 2–3.

³ Compl. – ECF No. 1 at 2.

⁴ Application – ECF No. 2 at 2; Orders – ECF Nos. 5, 10, and 16. In the application to proceed IFP, Mr. Long also listed (apparently) prior employment at Rent-a-Center with monthly gross income of \$1,200. Application – ECF No. 2 at 2.

⁵ See Docket.